

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Brot. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/664,374 09/17/2003 Feng-Limg Gordon Hsu C6658(V) 4550 EXAMINER 201 7590 03/09/2005 UNILEVER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS 700 SYLVAN AVENUE, ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **BLDG C2 SOUTH** ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100 1751

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/664,374	HSU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Necholus Ogden	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 De	ecember 2004.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b)□ objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		red in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau		od	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receiv	ea.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [Date Patent Application (PTO-152)	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/13/04</u>. 	6) Other:	G\$	

Application/Control Number: 10/664,374 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

Response to Amendment

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12-06-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the polyanionic ammonium surfactants are different and better that the anionic surfactants admixed with a polyamine, according to examples 1, 5 and 13.

The examiner contends that the examples show results, which are not unexpected or commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. For example, example 1 measures the clarity of the two component, which is not considered unexpected criticality; example 5 is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention because it comprises other ingredients not claimed and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to surmise the criticality of the two components in question and other ingredients were varied (i.e., citrate); and example 13 shows the deposition of the fluorescent whitening agent which is again not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention given the numerous ingredients exemplified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,374

Art Unit: 1751

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP (09003483).

JP '483 discloses a detergent composition containing an anionic surfactant whose counter-ion is a diamine salt (see abstract).

As this reference teaches all of the instantly required it is considered anticipatory.

4. Claims 1, 2 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vander Meer (4,597,898).

Vander Meer discloses a laundry detergent composition comprising ethoxylated amines or polyamines having anionic groups (see col. 5 lines 5-60; claims and example III).

As this reference teaches all of the instantly required it is considered anticipatory.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 12-13-04 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS**MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1751

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholus Ogden whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Necholus Ogden Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751 Application/Control Number: 10/664,374 Page 5

Art Unit: 1751

3-2-05